

limit development so there will be no disturbance to calving during the June-July calving season. This is not about protecting the environment and the caribou that live in it. Mr. Anderson's objection must be about something else.

Look at the objections that opponents voice to exploring in ANWR. One is that it is an insignificant amount of oil, not worth developing. If it isn't, we will make a park out of it. But that is nonsense. The USGS estimates Alaska's portion of the Coastal Plain—I would say the occupant of the chair has been up there—the estimate is it contains between 6 and 16 billion gallons of economically recoverable oil. If it is 10 billion barrels alone, the average, it is equivalent to 30 years of oil we would import from Saudi Arabia at the current rate, and 50 years equal to what we import currently from Iraq.

By the way, 16 billion barrels is 2.5 times the size of the published estimate of the new Canadian reserves in the Mackenzie Delta area, here. It is absurd to think that ANWR only represents a 6-month supply of oil as some opponents say. That would assume that ANWR is this country's only source of oil.

Some say it will take too long to get ANWR oil flowing. But it certainly will take less time to produce than some of the potential deposits in Canada. And if we are truly at war against terrorism, we have the national will to develop Alaska oil quickly, while still protecting the environment.

We built the Pentagon in 18 months, the Empire State Building in a year and built the 1,800-mile Alaska Highway in 9 months. Oil could be flowing out of ANWR quickly if we made a total commitment to make that happen. I believe we could do this in 12 months instead of the five years, some predict.

There are many other misstatements about Alaska's potential for oil development. We will have time to discuss those in this body as we work on a national energy policy that makes sense for America. That debate must occur soon; we must give the President the tools he needs to ensure our energy security. I know members on both sides of the aisle are anxious to make this happen.

But I wanted to come and respond to the comments made by Canada's environment minister, because they were horribly unbalanced in light of Canada's oil drilling program in the migratory route of the Porcupine caribou herd.

I encourage an opportunity to debate Mr. Anderson, and I stand behind my assertion that, indeed, his comments don't reflect the reality nor the true picture of what is going on in Canada.

Again, I have fondness for our Canadian friends and Canada itself. I am not saying they are harming the environment in the least. I am pointing out what they are doing. The Members of this body need to know that as well.

I welcome additional oil production in North America, as long as it is done in an environmentally sound manner. Again, I remind all of us that we give very little thought to where our oil comes from as long as we get it. We should do it right in North America, Canada, and Alaska, as opposed to it coming from overseas, over which we have really no control.

I find the objections to be unbalanced and grossly unfair since they totally ignore the environmental issues involved in oil development in the Arctic.

I also find the Environment Minister's statement just days after the tragedy in New York and Washington not only untimely but unfortunate.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor. I wish my colleagues a good day.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the energy policy-related amendments filed by the Senator from Oklahoma. While I support moving forward with comprehensive national energy policy, the underlying bill is too important to our national security to bog it down with controversial amendments.

There are many substantive problems with these amendments, not the least of which is their probable negative impact on public health and environmental quality. They take us back to the polluting past, rather than forward into a cleaner, more efficient and sustainable future.

There are also serious procedural problems with moving on these amendments. The committees of jurisdiction, including the Environment and Public Works Committee, have not completed work on important parts of comprehensive energy legislation.

Also, I would remind Senators that the administration has completed very few, if any, of the reports recommended by the Vice-President's National Energy Policy Development group. I believe these reports were intended to inform and justify to the public and Congress the need for any changes to existing law and programs.

These amendments drive us further and further away from making the truly fundamental changes in our national energy policy that are necessary to address global climate change.

The amendments will dramatically increase U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. That further violates our commitment in the Rio Agreement to reduce to 1990 levels.

The next Conference of Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change begins in late October. Despite the terrorist attacks on our Nation, the attendees will hope for U.S. leadership to combat global warming.

Whatever the administration may present, I hope the message from the U.S. Senate will not be the recent adoption of a national energy policy that blatantly undermines our Senate-

ratified commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The underlying bill already sets us up to violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense Treaty. That is enough to weigh down one bill.

We should not further encroach on the good will of our global neighbors at a time when we are seeking their support in our efforts against terrorism. I urge the defeat of these amendments when and if they are offered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Is the Senator aware that since back to and including the First World War the outcome of every war has been determined by energy? Is the Senator aware that we are now 56.7-percent dependent upon foreign countries for our ability to fight a war and that half of it is coming from the Middle East? And is the Senator aware that the largest increase in terms of our dependency on any one country is Iraq, a country with which we are in war right now?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am aware of the situations the Senator describes. I am just concerned about the methodology being utilized to try to solve that. I would like to work together with the members of the committee to try to see if we can find common ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

EVENTS OF THE LAST TWO WEEKS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reflect on some of the experiences I have had over the last 2 weeks, and also the activity of the U.S. Congress, and in particular the Senate.

It is hard to believe it has only been 2 weeks and 1 day since the tragedy of September 11. It seems such a longer period of time because of all the emotions and all the experiences and all the visual images which have been burned into our minds and our hearts.

I think so many times of that day and what happened to me. Yet when I meet anyone on the street in Chicago or any part of Illinois and Springfield, they all go through the same life experience. They want to tell me where they were and how their lives were touched and changed by September 11. It was a defining moment for America. It is one which none of us will ever forget.

Over 6,500 innocent Americans lost their lives on that day—the greatest loss of American life, I am told, of any day in our history, including the battles of the Civil War.

Of course, we weren't the only country to lose lives in the World Trade Center. It is reported in the papers today that more German citizens lost their lives to terrorism on September 11 at the World Trade Center than in any of the terrorist acts on record in Germany. The stories are repeated many times over.

Yesterday, the father of one of the victims of American Flight 77 that

crashed into the Pentagon came to my office and spoke about his wonderful daughter. He reflected on her life and the life of so many in my home State of Illinois—lives that were lost on September 11. We have tried to address that.

Yesterday, we had a hearing on airport and airline security in the Governmental Affairs Committee under Chairman JOE LIEBERMAN, the Senator from Connecticut. Other Members came forward to hear testimony from the appropriate Federal agencies—the FAA, the Department of Transportation's inspector general, as well as the General Accounting Office.

Then we brought in a panel of those who were more directly in contact with air service—the vice president of American Airlines; airport managers from Bloomington, IL; from North Carolina; from St. Louis' Lambert; and Aubrey Harvey, who was a screener at one of the airport security stations at O'Hare, came. If I am not mistaken, he was the first person actually involved in that profession who came forward to tell his side of the story about airport security.

It was an important hearing. I think it dramatized the need for us to focus on several achievements as a nation.

First and foremost, we must restore the confidence of the American public to get back on airplanes. That will require several actions. It requires, first, to have an immediate visible security response to what occurred on September 11. Changes have taken place in every airport. I have been to O'Hare and to Dulles and to Baltimore, as well as to St. Louis since that event. I have seen the changes. They are important. They are significant. They may not be enough. We need to do more. We need to do it quickly.

I have noted that after Secretary Mineta, of the Department of Transportation, testified last week, I suggested that he immediately write to every airport manager and communicate to them the need to put in place at every airport security checkpoint a uniformed law enforcement officer.

Secretary Mineta, whom I respect and admire so very much, said some airports have done that. I urged him to make sure every airport does that because I think it changes the environment of the airport. It makes security a more serious matter.

I do not know if it was a coincidence or what, but when I went up to Baltimore to catch the plane last Friday, as I went through the airport security, there were five or six very serious screening employees and two law enforcement personnel there. They not only went through my luggage—which was something I invited them to do—then they did the wand all over me, and then checked to see if there was any explosive residue on my briefcase. I do not know if they knew who I was, but they, frankly, responded with the most amazing display of security I have ever seen at one time at an airport; and I travel a lot.

Let me tell you something else. I do not begrudge a single moment of the time they asked of me, and neither should any other American. There is a little inconvenience involved in this, but for our safety and security it is not too much to ask. When I think about giving up 30 seconds or a minute of my life, I reflect on how many people are making such extraordinary sacrifices of their time and their lives in the interest of the security of America. That is not too much to ask any airline passenger.

But now we see in airports across America a change in attitude and a change in approach. At all the airports I visited—four in the last 2 weeks—I have seen a much more serious approach to security.

Yesterday we talked about the security on the ramp, as well, in terms of all of those people who have access to airplanes. We focused on passengers and what they bring on board, but we should also focus on every single person who can enter that airplane at any time; not only the pilot and crew, but also those who are responsible for baggage handling, fueling the plane, catering services, cleanup crews. All of those people have access to that airplane.

A search of one of the grounded airplanes after the event found one of those notorious box cutters wedged in the cushion of a seat of the plane. Whether the passenger left it there or it was planted is unknown, but it at least raises an important security question.

So when we talk about security in airports, it is not just the screening, it is not just the questions asked of passengers, it is to make sure that the ramp and the perimeter around the airport is secure, that we know the people who are coming in contact with that plane, that they have been checked out, that they are hard-working, good people, who are not going to be involved in anything that would endanger the life of another.

One of the baggage handlers from O'Hare called me. I spoke to him in my office the other day. He told me about his experience. Did you know baggage handlers at O'Hare start at \$8.50 an hour? I did not know that. In a few years they can get as high as \$19 an hour, but, again, it reminds us that many of the people who are in direct contact with the airplane and its contents are people in starting-wage jobs that require perhaps minimal education and minimal training. I think that has to change.

I think we need to raise the standards, the skills, and the compensation to the people who are involved in security. I think we have to consider security as not just part of the process of taking a flight but an element of law enforcement. When you take that into consideration, you start changing your standards as to what you might expect.

So I believe we should federalize this activity. There have been a number of

suggestions on how to do it. Some have said we should actually have Federal employees directly involved. I am not opposed to that concept. I am open to it. I am trying to keep an open mind to the most cost-efficient way to guarantee the security as best we can of airline travel.

Others have asked, how about a governmental corporation that has this responsibility that operates under the rules and standards promulgated by the Federal Government? That, too, is an approach which I think we should consider. But more than anything, we have to make it clear to the American people that we are going to do something, and we are going to do it soon, and that it is safe for them to get back on airplanes.

I am still flying commercial flights. Most of my colleagues in the Senate are—in fact, all of them. I think it is a testament to our belief that we have confidence in air travel. We have to convince the rest of the American people.

Let me address another issue that was raised a few moments ago in this Chamber by my colleague from New Jersey, Senator TORRICELLI. It is one which I have heard him express before, and one I have reflected on, and on which I have come to an agreement with him. It is the question of our preparedness as a nation for what occurred on September 11.

Back before the United States was engaged in World War II, President Franklin Roosevelt called on George Marshall, an Army general, to prepare the United States for the possibility of war. I remember, in reading the biography of George C. Marshall, one of our Nation's heroes, they talked of his first trip to the so-called War Department, I believe it was, in 1940.

He went to the War Department, and he asked what battle plans were there for him to review. They went to the vault, opened it, and pulled out the battle plan—the one battle plan—which had been prepared for the War Department of the United States of America in 1940.

George Marshall opened the folder to discover that battle plan was for the invasion of Mexico. That is all he had. No one had thought ahead about other possibilities. And in a short period of time, America was involved in a world war. We were not prepared and had to race to become prepared, not only to provide the goods and services and resources for our allies in the war but to make sure we could defend ourselves. America rose to that challenge, but we lost valuable time because we were not prepared.

The obvious question we must ask, as Members of Congress, is, Were we prepared for September 11? Well, clearly, the answer is no. For the United States to have faced the greatest invasion, the greatest attack, the greatest crisis in our history, is to say, on its face, that we were not prepared.

And I have to point to a number of areas. Whether it is in the military

field or law enforcement or intelligence, in all three levels there are important questions that need to be asked and answered about our failure to avert this terrible crisis.

We have identified some 19 alleged hijackers who were involved in this endeavor. I think we understand that there probably were hundreds more who had some part to play in this sad and tragic drama that cost so many lives. But to think what they have done to America—those people, one day in our history—it has changed our Nation.

I would like to say that we can brush it off and go on about our business. Everybody knows better. Life in this country is going to be different, and it must be different so we can avert that kind of crisis in the future and be prepared for our own defense.

Now we have requests coming to us from agencies representing the U.S. military, law enforcement, such as the FBI, and the intelligence agencies, for additional resources and additional authority. I join every other Member of the Senate in a bipartisan, solid vote giving the President and his administration all of the resources and authority they have asked for. I think we feel that party labels should be put aside. We have to stand together in Congress to wage this war against terrorism. We want to provide the President what he needs to be successful in that effort. We want to provide him the resources he needs so the men and women in uniform, and everyone involved in this effort, have the tools they need to succeed.

Now we are receiving requests from the Attorney General, and from others, to change the laws of the United States to provide additional authority to those who are involved in fighting terrorism. I do not think that is an unreasonable thing to do. In fact, some of the requests that have been made by the Department of Justice are eminently sensible.

I think it is important that we have changes, for example, in the authority to eavesdrop or have wiretaps to reflect new technology. In the old days, the FBI would turn over the name of a person and the telephone number and ask for authority from the court to put a wiretap on a phone.

Today, of course, that suspected person may have in fact a dozen cell phones and change three or four numbers a day. We have to be prepared to follow them through all of the different levels of technology people can use against us. I don't think that is unreasonable.

Changing the statute of limitations on crimes of terrorism? Of course, we should. We have to view this as more than just a garden variety crime because we have seen the terrible disaster that occurred on September 11.

Other requests have been made by the FBI and CIA for the collection of more information beyond what I have just mentioned. It raises an important

point that we should pause and study. We have seen in the past that these information-gathering agencies have collected enormous amounts of data, whether it is electronic data or data from human intelligence resources. And many times that data has not been assimilated, formulated, or distributed so that it can be used in effective law enforcement and the deterrence of the kind of disaster and tragedy we experienced on September 11.

I ask, at least as part of this debate, that Congress come to these same agencies and ask them what they have done in the past with similar information, how much of a backlog of unprocessed information they currently have, and what they are going to do with any new information they receive.

Before we expand this authority to collect more information, it is reasonable to ask the capacity of these agencies to assimilate and to use this information in a valuable fashion.

How many Arabic speakers are available at the CIA and FBI if we are going to focus on those who are involved in this latest terrorism and any conversations among people who use that particular language? That is an important question and one which I think we will come to find is not answered to our satisfaction. We have to do better.

I also have to relate that for the first time in 20 years, the Judiciary Committee, just a few months ago, had a thorough investigation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and came up with some major concerns. It is hard for me to believe that this premier law enforcement agency in America is still so far behind the times when it comes to important technology such as computers. The computer capability of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was described as 10 years behind the rest of America. At a time when it should be on the cutting edge, it is that far behind. That needs to change. It needs to change immediately.

Providing access to more information without the ability to assimilate it, to process it, to distribute it is, frankly, a waste of our time. We cannot afford to waste a moment in this war against terrorism.

I have the greatest confidence in Bob Mueller, who has been appointed as the new Director of the FBI. I salute President Bush and those who were instrumental in naming him. He is an excellent choice. I believe he and Attorney General Ashcroft have an opportunity to work together to not only give more authority and resources to the FBI but to also change the climate at the FBI in terms of how it works internally and how it works with other agencies.

Yesterday Attorney General Ashcroft told us that the FBI's wanted list and list of dangerous individuals in America had not been shared with the Federal Aviation Administration before September 11. What that meant was that those names that were suspicious were never given by the FAA to the airlines so they could monitor the

travel of these people. That seems so basic. It reflects, unfortunately, a sad state of affairs when it comes to the exchange of this information.

Let me speak for a moment about the daunting task we face in challenging terrorism around the world. The President is right. He has done the appropriate thing in warning the American people that this is a long-term commitment, that we need to take a look and find the resources of this global terrorism network and cut them off where we can—financial resources, political resources, whatever they are gathering from other nations, organizations, and persons. We have to stop that flow, to try to choke off this global terrorism. That is going to take quite a bit of effort and patience.

The other day I met with a prosecutor who had spent most of his professional life prosecuting the Osama bin Laden terrorists. For 30 minutes he sat down and described for me from start to finish his experience with this group. I came away with the following impression: They are educated; they are determined; they are invisible; they are patient; and they hate us.

I was sobered by that presentation because he went through, chapter and verse, every single item he had discovered in the course of prosecuting these terrorists. I came away with the belief that we are not dealing with a ragtag bunch that got lucky, in their view, on September 11 with terrorism. They know what they are doing.

We have to know what we are doing. We have to be prepared to fight this battle and to win it as quickly and as decisively as possible.

Let me suggest that as we get into this, as we make this dedicated effort to fight terrorism as a nation, we should stop and we should reflect on the state of affairs on September 11, 2001, in America. It is time to ask the painful and hard questions of where the intelligence community failed, where law enforcement failed, where our Government failed, when it came to averting that crisis.

This is not an easy task. Some have suggested maybe we should put that aside for another day. I don't think so. There were clear omissions, and there were clear problems within our collection of intelligence that led to what happened on September 11. We need to know what they were. We need to know if they changed. We need to know, for example, whether this exchange of information by law enforcement agencies has now changed for the better and decisively.

To do that, I agree with Senator TORRICELLI, we should establish a board of inquiry that asks these hard and difficult questions and reports back to Congress, to the President, and to the American people about what we did wrong and how we need to change it.

There is a rich tradition of this sort of inquiry. Senator Harry Truman of

Missouri was involved in a similar inquiry in the 1940s when it came to defense contractors and whether they were wasting taxpayer dollars. As has been noted, the Challenger disaster led to a board of inquiry that changed the way the National Aeronautics and Space Administration did their business. There were inquiries throughout our history when something important and catastrophic was happening in America.

We can do no less today than to dedicate resources to an inquiry that gets to the heart of what our deficiencies are when it comes to fighting terrorism.

I suggest my colleagues consider that there are many we can turn to, to help us in this effort. Certainly there are committees of Congress on both sides of the aisle in the House and the Senate that could have a legitimate role to play in this question.

We might consider turning to some of our former colleagues to establish this kind of commission of inquiry to ask about what we failed to do and how we failed to avert the crisis of September 11. As I sat here today reflecting, names came to mind immediately: Senator Bob Kerrey, former Senator from Nebraska, recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, former chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee; Senator Bob Dole of Kansas, Republican majority leader; Sam Nunn, former Senator from Georgia, well respected for his expertise when it comes to the armed services; former Senator from Missouri John Danforth, who just recently conducted an investigation of the FBI on the Waco incident, and his findings were accepted by all as being thorough and professional; John Glenn, former Senator from Ohio, who has a legendary reputation not only on Capitol Hill but across America; Mark Hatfield of Oregon, who served as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Chuck Robb, former marine in Vietnam and Senator from Virginia; Warren Rudman from New Hampshire.

These are eight names that could come together quickly and be willing to serve this country in a commission of inquiry as to what went wrong at the CIA and the FBI and the Pentagon and throughout the Government on September 11. I believe they can give us a roadmap so we can talk about changes that need to be made, and made immediately, to avert any future crisis.

I agree with Senator TORRICELLI: This is something we should not put off. We ought to do it and do it soon. It is not a reflection of disunity on the part of those of us who suggest it but just the opposite. As we have stood with the President to make sure he is effective in fighting this war for America, let us stand together in a bipartisan fashion to concede our weaknesses and shortfalls from the past so we don't repeat those terrible mistakes.

Mr. President, I will conclude by noting one other event that happened in the last several weeks, which has been nothing short of amazing. It is a rebirth of patriotism in America the likes of which I have never witnessed. There was a time during the Vietnam war when the American flag lapel pin was worn by some in support of the war and shunned by others as an indication of supporting a war they thought was wrong.

That has changed so much. You will find Americans across the board proud of their flag, proud of their country. I was in Chicago Saturday morning and stopped at a car rental agency, and the lady behind the desk recognized my name when I filled out the contract.

She said: Senator, I can't find a flag anywhere, and I am trying to get one I can wear.

I pulled out this ribbon from my pocket—a lapel pin that many Members have been wearing. I said: Why don't you take this one.

She said: I think I am going to break down and cry. It meant so much for her to have it, to be able to wear it. I also gave one to the lady working with her. I thought how quickly we have come together as a nation.

You have seen it in so many ways, large and small. Huge rallies are taking place at the Daly Center in Chicago. There are long lines of people waiting to donate blood. Donations are being given to the United Way and Red Cross and all of the charitable organizations. There is an intense feeling of pride and patriotism at public events across the board.

I have noticed that people are listening more carefully to our National Anthem—to the words that we used to say by memory—perhaps without thinking so many times. There is that pause when we get to the point in that great National Anthem when we say:

O say, does that star-spangled Banner yet wave,

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I think those words have special meaning for us because the Star Spangled Banner, our national flag, still waves—not just on porches and buildings across America and across Illinois, downstate and in Chicago, but in our hearts as well. We will prevail.

Those who thought they could bring us to our knees have brought us to our feet. This country will be victorious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to make my remarks while seated at my desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN SERVICE MEMBERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, after those dastardly terrorists deliberately

murdered—and I use those words advisedly—thousands of American citizens in New York, Washington, and in the plane crash in Pennsylvania, President Bush instructed our armed services to “be ready.”

Mr. President, our Nation is at war with terrorism. Everybody knows that. Thousands in our Armed Forces are already risking their lives around the globe, preparing to fight in that war. We bade farewell to 2,000 or 3,000 marines from North Carolina last week.

These are all courageous men and women who are not afraid to face up to evil terrorists, and they are ready to risk their lives to preserve and to protect what I like to call the miracle of America.

And that is why I am among those of their fellow countrymen who insist that these men and women who are willing to risk their lives to protect their country and fellow Americans should not have to face the persecution of the International Criminal Court—which ought to be called the International Kangaroo Court. This court will be empowered when 22 more nations ratify the Rome Treaty.

Instead of helping the United States go after real war criminals and terrorists, the International Criminal Court has the unbridled power to intimidate our military people and other citizens with bogus, politicized prosecutions.

Similar creations of the United Nations have shown that this is inevitable.

Earlier this year, the U.N. Human Rights Commission kicked off the United States—the world's foremost advocate of human rights—to the cheers of dictators around the globe.

The United Nation's conference on racism in Durban, South Africa, this past month, became an agent of hate rather than against hate. With this track record, it is not difficult to anticipate that the U.N.'s International Criminal Court will be in a position not merely to prosecute, but to persecute our soldiers and sailors for alleged war crimes as they risk their lives fighting the scourge of terrorism.

Therefore, now is the time for the Senate to move to protect those who are protecting us.

I have an amendment at the desk to serve as a sort of insurance policy for our troops. My amendment is supported by the Bush administration and is based on the “American Service Members Protection Act,” which I introduced this past May. It is cosponsored by Senators MILLER, HATCH, SHELBY, MURKOWSKI, BOND, and ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be filed with the DOD authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be filed.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, many Americans may not realize that the Rome Treaty can apply to Americans even without the U.S. ratifying the treaty. This bewildering threat to America's men and women in our Armed Forces must be stopped.